

Amendments to the Drawings:

New FIGURE 3 of the drawings is hereby submitted for acceptance.

FIGURES 1 and 2 are renumbered accordingly.

Remarks

This together with a petition for a one month extension of time for response including the fee is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed September 12, 2006. Upon entry of the amendments to the claims, claims 1-5, 7-24, 26-41, 43-57, and 71-72 remain pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 22, 26, 32, 33, 35, 36, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 71, and 72, and has canceled claims 6, 25, 42, 58-66, 67-70, and 73-74. Applicant has canceled claims 21 - 26 to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

In response to objections to the drawings, new FIGURE 3 is added to show the system under test ("SUT") and its constituent parts. FIGURE 3 is a representation of what is described on page 10 of the Specification as

originally filed and as such, no new matter is added. It is believed that the addition of FIGURE 3 fully addresses the objections to the drawings and acceptance of the drawings is respectfully requested. Renumbered replacement sheets for FIGURES 1 and 2 are also provided.

The Specification is amended to include reference to new FIGURE 3 and to include reference numbers that refer to elements of FIGURE 3. Accordingly, replacement pages 7 and 10 of the Specification are provided. No new matter is added.

Claim 1 is rejected as obvious. Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 6. Claim 6 is objected to as allowable but dependent upon a rejected base claim. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 7-21 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable because of their dependence upon an allowable independent claim. Claim 6 is cancelled. Claim 13 is objected to as indefinite. Claims 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 16, are amended to clarify and to correct dependency upon a cancelled claim. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 2-5 and 7-21 are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 is rejected as obvious. Claim 22 is amended to include the limitations of claim 25. Claim 25 is objected to as allowable but dependent upon a rejected base claim. Accordingly, claim 22 as amended is believed to be allowable.

Claims 23-24 and 26-40 depend from claim 22 and are believed to be allowable because of their dependence upon an allowable independent claim. Claim 25 is cancelled. Claim 32 is objected to as indefinite. Claims 26, 32, 33, 35, and 36, are amended to clarify and to correct dependency upon a cancelled claim. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 23-24 and 26-40 are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 41 is rejected as obvious. Claim 41 is amended to include the limitations of claim 42. Claim 42 is objected to as allowable but dependent upon a rejected base claim. Accordingly, claim 41 as amended is believed to be allowable.

Claims 43-57 depend from claim 41 and are believed to be allowable because of their dependence upon an allowable independent claim. Claim 42 is cancelled. Claim 49 is objected to as indefinite. Claims 43, 45, 47, and 49, are amended to clarify and to correct

dependency upon a cancelled claim. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 43-57 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 58-70 are cancelled.

Claim 71 is rejected as obvious. Claim 71 is amended to include the limitations of "the observed variability of the results of the system test is defined by an observed variability of a pass-fail conflicted shared function". Paragraph 47 of the Office Action reflects that this limitation is not shown in the prior art. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 71 as amended is allowable.

Claim 72 is rejected as obvious. Claim 72 is amended to include the limitations of "the observed variability of the results of the system test is defined by an observed variability of a pass-fail conflicted shared function". Paragraph 47 of the Office Action reflects that this limitation is not shown in the prior art. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 72 as amended is allowable.

All objections and rejections in the Office Action being fully addressed, it is believed that the present

patent application as amended is in condition for allowance and allowance is solicited.

If any clarifications can be made by way of telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the Undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Manley et al.
Applicant(s)

/June L. Bouscaren/
June L. Bouscaren
Corporate Counsel
Registration No. 37,928
Attorney for Applicants

Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Legal Dept.
900 South Taft Rd.
Loveland, CO 80537
Phone: (970) 679-3238
Fax: (970) 679-5772